

.

From: O'Brien, Elisabeth (DPH)
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2009 10:09 AM
To: Nassif, Julianne (DPH); Salemi, Charles (DPH)
Subject: Worcester lab diversion 100 samples

If the Worcester lab is really on board with taking 100 samples per month I see 3 possible scenarios.

1. We directly transfer samples from us to them.

Pros: They receive samples that we determine are the most beneficial to us in helping us deal with our backlog.
Cons: working out a chain of custody

2. We divert one large city that brings in about 100 samples per month (say Fall River) to Worcester.

Pros: Only dealing with diverting one city for the time being.

Cons: There are not a lot of 100/sample per month cities. With the exception of Boston and New Bedford most are less than that. I chose Fall River because on the map it doesn't look like it is too much further to drive to Worcester than Boston for him and he brings in about 100/month on average, maybe a little less.

3. We temporarily reassign several towns/cities to Worcester.

Pros: Can't think of one other than meeting the objective of diverting samples.

Cons:

1. We are already sending towns closest to Worcester to Sudbury
2. These departments will still need to come to Boston to pick up analyzed samples.
3. Also, as we assess the impact of the new marijuana law, some of these towns may not be bringing as many samples anyway, so it will be hard for us to know how many we are actually diverting. Identifying 10 towns that bring a total of 100 samples on average to the Boston lab now may actually result in a future diversion of only 40 samples to Worcester. The logistics of dealing with multiple departments making a diversion to Worcester on a month to month basis takes time and coordination and might not be worth the effort.

I strongly favor scenario 1 as we can maintain control over what gets analyzed and we could begin immediately. We could also stop immediately if they need us to. Anyway, it was just a few thoughts I had.

Betsy